

**FINAL ORDER  
EXHIBIT A  
DR 2010-02, PP 2010-01**

*Approval Criteria*

Applicable criteria from the Woodburn Development Ordinance (WDO) are Sections: 2.106 (Commercial General District Standards), 3.101 (Street Standards), 3.104 (Access), 3.105 (Off-Street Parking and Loading), 3.106 (Landscaping), 3.107 (Architectural Design), 4.101 (Decision Making Procedures), 4.102 (Review, Interpretation and Enforcement), and 5.103 (Type III Application Requirements.) Additional relevant criteria are the accessible parking standards of Section 1104 of the Oregon Structural Specialty Code and ORS 447.233 and the right-of-way standards of the Woodburn Transportation System Plan.

*General Provisions*

Findings: Per Table 4.1, Design Reviews for structures 1000 square feet or more are Type III decisions. The current application is for a 6,804 square foot building. Per Section WDO 4.101.10.C, the Planning Commission is the City decision-maker for Type III decisions.

Conclusion: The application is correctly filed as a Type III Design Review.

*WDO 2.106                      Commercial General (CG) district standards*

Finding: Ambulatory health services are permitted by right under Section 2.106.01.M.1.

Conclusion: The clinic is a conforming use in the CG zone.

Findings: Table 2.1.10 provides that “In a CG zone the lot area for a non-residential use shall be adequate to contain all structures within the required setbacks. There shall be no minimum width or depth.” The clinic is a nonresidential use. The site plan shows the proposed clinic to be in a conforming location with respect to setbacks.

Conclusion: The lot is conforming in the CG zone.

Findings: Section 2.106.05.B provides that “The maximum height of buildings shall not exceed 70 feet ....” The building elevations show the building to be approximately 24 feet high, as building height is defined in Section 1.102.

Conclusion: The building is conforming for height in the CG zone.

Findings: Section 2.106.05.C.1.a.1 provides that “The minimum setback abutting a street shall be 15 feet plus any Special Setback, Section 3.103.05.” The site plan shows the clinic to be located

approximately 39 feet from the property line abutting Progress Way. The proposed future expansion is shown as being 20 feet from the property line abutting Progress Way.

Conclusion: The clinic as currently proposed and as expanded in the future meets the required setback abutting a street.

Findings: Section 2.106.05.C.1.b.1 provides that “Off street parking, maneuvering and storage shall be prohibited within a required setback EXCEPT for parking, maneuvering and storage adjacent to a wall.” The site plan shows a vehicle maneuvering area extending to the north property line.

Conclusions: To comply with Section 2.106.05.C.1.b.1, the property owner must either (1) provide a wall where the vehicle maneuvering area abuts the north property line, or (2) redesign the vehicle maneuvering area so that it is not within the required setback, or (3) enter into a shared access agreement with the property to the north (see the analysis of Section .104.03.A.3.b, below.)

<b>TABLE 2.1.11 Interior Yard and Buffer Standards CG Zones</b>			
<b>Abutting Property</b>	<b>Landscaping</b>	<b>Wall</b>	<b>Interior Setback</b>
<b>CO, CG, DDC, NNC, P/SP, IP, SWIR or IL zone</b>	There is no buffer yard landscaping requirement for an interior yard abutting a buffer wall.	Alternative A: Wall requirements shall be determined in conjunction with the applicable Design Review process.  Alternative B: No wall required.	Alternative A: 5 ft.  Alternative B: Zero setback abutting a building wall.

Findings: Table 2.1.11 sets the side and rear yard requirements in the CG zone. The property abuts land zoned CG and IP. The site plan shows the building to be located more than 5 feet from any side or rear property line.

Conclusion: The clinic as currently proposed and as expanded in the future meets the required interior setbacks.

Findings: Section 2.106.06.E.3 provides that “Common refuse collection facilities shall be screened on all sides by an architectural block wall and solid gate, both with an anti-graffiti surface, a minimum of six feet and a maximum of seven feet in height.” The site plan shows a refuse collection facility and “6’-0” high brick masonry walls with solid access doors.”

Conclusion: The proposed development complies with Section 2.105.06.F.3.

### *WDO 3.101*

### *Street Standards*

Findings: Progress Way is designated as a Service Collector in the Transportation System Plan (TSP.) The required cross-section for a Service Collector is a 72 foot of right-of-way, 36 foot improved driving surface (two 12 foot traffic lanes and a 12 foot center turn lane), 6 foot bike lanes (optional), 6 foot landscape strips and 6 foot sidewalks on both sides. The existing cross-section is a 90 foot right-of-way, 44 foot improved driving surface, and no planter strips on either side. No sidewalk exists on the west side of the street. A 5 foot sidewalk exists on the east side of Progress Way from Mt. Hood Avenue to approximately the northern edge of the southerly access easement. Street trees are planted on both sides of Progress Way. No striping is provided to delineate bicycle lanes. The site plan shows an extension of the sidewalk to the north property line.

Conclusions: Progress Way meets the dedication and improved surface requirements of the TSP. Sidewalk and street tree improvements will be required under Section 3.107.06.B.9. The sidewalk and street trees proposed as part of this development meet the requirements of Section 3.107.06.B.9.

### *WDO 3.104*

### *Access*

Findings: Section 3.104.01.B.1 provides that “A City permit shall be required for any new or modified vehicular access to a street that is under City jurisdiction.” The current project does not require any new or modified vehicular access.

Conclusion: An access permit is not required.

Findings: Section 3.104.03.A.3.b provides that “Similar, and/or compatible, uses on abutting lots should have interconnected on-site access and parking facilities. Such shared facilities serving properties under separate ownership shall be subject to legal documentation, to the satisfaction of the City Attorney, establishing permanent use of the access and parking facilities. The agreement shall be recorded with the County Recorder and filed with the ... Director.” There is a platted access easement along the south property line.

Conclusions: The access easement along the south property line provides connectivity to abutting lots on the south and east. The property owner should enter into a shared access agreement with the abutting property to the north. Such an agreement would eliminate the requirement for a wall along the northern boundary of the parking lot (see the analysis of Section 2.106.05.C.1.b.1, above.)

### *WDO 3.105*

### *Off Street Parking and Loading*

Findings: Table 3.1.2 gives the required for off-street parking ratio. The site plan shows 39 off-street parking spaces.

<b>TABLE 3.1.2            Off Street Parking Ratio Standards</b>	
<b>Use</b>	<b>Parking Ratio</b> - spaces per activity unit or square feet of gross floor area (sfgfa)
52. Ambulatory health services [Including doctors and dentists] (621)	1.0/ 250 sfgfa

Conclusions: The proposed 6,804 square foot building requires 27 off-street parking spaces. The future 1,718 square foot expansion requires 7 additional spaces. The proposed development, including the future expansion, complies with Table 3.1.2.

Findings: Section 3.105.02.E.2 provides that “Off street vehicle parking spaces shall not exceed 2.0 times the amount required in Table 3.1.2.” The proposed building requires 27 off-street parking spaces. The site plan shows 39 spaces.

Conclusion: The site does not exceed the maximum number of off-street parking spaces.

Findings: Section 3.105.02.E.3 provides that “The number of disabled person vehicle parking spaces shall be provided to the standards of the state Building Code and applicable federal standards.” The state requirements are codified in ORS 447.233.

The number of accessible parking spaces shall be:

Total Parking In Lot	Required Minimum Number of Accessible Spaces
26 to 50	2

[ORS 447.233(2)(a)]

In addition, one in every eight accessible spaces, but not less than one, shall be van accessible.  
[ORS 447.233(2)(b)]

A van accessible parking space shall be at least nine feet wide and shall have an adjacent access aisle that is at least eight feet wide. [ORS 447.233(2)(b)]

Accessible parking spaces shall be at least nine feet wide and shall have an adjacent access aisle that is at least six feet wide. [ORS 447.233(2)(c)]

The site plan shows two accessible spaces, called out as 9 feet wide by 19 feet long. The width of the access aisle is not called out.

Conclusion: The number and dimensions of the accessible spaces comply with Section 3.105.02.E.3. The property owner shall verify that the access aisle is at least 8 feet wide, in accordance with Section 3.105.02.E.3 and ORS 447.233(2)(b).

Findings: Section 3.105.02.F provides that “A maximum of 20 percent of the required vehicle parking spaces may be satisfied by compact vehicle parking spaces.” The site plan shows 8 compact parking spaces, and 39 total spaces.

Conclusions: Compact parking comprises 30% of the 27 parking spaces required for the currently proposed building, and 24% of the 34 parking spaces required for the future expanded building. The additional compact vehicle spaces cannot be counted as *required* parking, but may be provided as *excess* parking. The proposed development complies with Section 3.105.02.F for both the currently proposed building and the future expanded building.

Findings: Table 3.1.3 sets the minimum dimensions for loading spaces. The proposed building will contain 6,804 square feet of gross floor area, with a future 1,718 square foot expansion. The site plan shows one exterior loading zone, called out in a note as 12 feet wide and 20 feet long.

<b>TABLE 3.1.3 Loading Space Requirements</b>				
Use	Minimum No. of Spaces	Minimum Size of Space		
		Width	Length	Height
<b>For buildings used entirely for office occupancy</b> (square feet of gross floor area) ... 2,000-41,999	1	12 feet	20	14

Conclusions: The proposed development and proposed future expansion meet the requirements of Table 3.1.3.

Findings: Table 3.1.4 sets the minimum dimensions for parking spaces and drive aisles. The site plan shows 90° parking with 29 standard spaces, called out in a note as 9 feet wide and 19 feet long, and 8 compact spaces, called out as at 7.5 feet wide and 15 feet long. The drive aisles are scale at 24 feet wide minimum, but widths are not called out.

<b>TABLE 3.1.4 Parking Space and Aisle Dimensions (See Figure 6.10)</b>						
Aisle	Type	Width (Measured from the midpoint of the double stripe)	Curb Length	1-Way Aisle Width	2-Way Aisle Width	Stall Depth
90°	Standard	9.0 feet	9.0 feet	24.0 feet	24.0 feet	19.0 feet
	Compact	7.5 feet	7.5 feet	22.0 feet	24.0 feet	15.0 feet

Conclusion: The proposed development complies with Table 3.1.4 for parking space dimensions. The property owner must verify that the drive aisles are a minimum of 24 feet wide, in accordance with Table 3.1.4.

Findings: Section 3.105.02.H.5 provides that “Off street parking and maneuvering areas shall have directional markings and signs to control vehicle movement.” The site plan does not show pavement markings or directional signage.

Conclusion: The property owner must provide directional markings and signs to control vehicle movement per Section 3.105.02.H.5.

Findings: Section 3.105.02.H.6 provides that “Off street parking spaces shall be delineated by double parallel lines on each side of a space. The total width of the lines shall delineate a separation of 2 feet.” The site plan shows single stripes.

Conclusion: The property owner must use double parallel lines with a separation of 2 feet to delineate the parking spaces, per Section 3.105.02.H.5.

Findings: Section 3.105.02.H.10 provides that “All uses required to provide 10 or more off street parking spaces shall provide a bicycle rack within 50 feet of the main entrance. The number of required rack spaces shall be one plus one per ten vehicle parking spaces, with a maximum of 20 rack spaces.” The proposed development requires 27 parking spaces. The future expansion requires 7 additional spaces. The site plan shows a bike rack for 5 bicycles.

Conclusions: The property owner must provide three bike rack spaces for the currently proposed building, and a total of four bike rack spaces for the future expanded building. The proposed development and proposed future expansion meet the requirements of Section 3.105.02.H.10.

### *WDO 3.106 Landscaping Standards*

Findings: Section 3.106.02.B provides that “All required landscaped areas shall be permanently irrigated unless a planting plan without irrigation is submitted by a licensed landscape architect or a licensed nursery person demonstrating that the proposed landscaping will thrive without irrigation.” The landscaping plan does not show irrigation. Sheet C4.0 shows a 1” irrigation water meter and check valve, but no details of the irrigation system.

Conclusion: Prior to issuance of a building permit, the property owner shall provide details of the landscaping irrigation system to verify compliance with Section 3.106.02.B.

Findings: Section 3.106.02.C provides that “All shrubs and ground cover shall be of a size upon installation so as to attain 80% of ground coverage within 3 years.” The submittal does not address this code provision.

Conclusion: Prior to issuance of a building permit, the property owner shall verify that shrubs and ground cover will be of a size upon installation so as to attain 80% of ground coverage within 3 years, in accordance with Section 3.106.02.C.

Findings: Section 3.106.02.D provides that “Installation of plant materials and irrigation specified in an approved landscaping plan shall occur at the time of development and shall be a condition of final occupancy.”

Conclusion: Implementation of the landscaping plan will be verified during the building permit process, and will be a condition of final occupancy .

Findings: Section 3.106.03.A.2.b.1 provides that “All yards abutting a street, including off street parking and circulation areas shall be landscaped at a density of one (1) plant unit (PU) per 20 sq. ft.” The yard abutting Progress Way (as shown in Figure 6.3) is approximately 39 feet deep and 176 feet wide, and contains approximately 6,864 square feet. The landscaping plan appears to show 396 plant units of landscaping in the yard. The landscaping plan is for the current phase of construction only.

Conclusions: A total of 351 plant units of landscaping are necessary to meet the landscaping requirement for the current phase of construction. The landscaping proposed for the current phase of construction meets the requirement of Section 3.106.03.A.2.b.1. The future expansion will reduce the yard area and, consequently, the number of plant units required in the yard. Landscaping requirements for the future expansion can be verified during the building permit process.

Findings: Section 3.106.03.A.2.b.2 provides that “All parking areas abutting a street shall provide a 42-inch vertical visual screen from the abutting street grade.” The landscaping shows, along with other landscaping, a row of *Ligustrum Texanum* (Waxleaf Ligustrum) between the parking spaces and Progress Way. This evergreen shrub is reported to approach 6-9 feet high at maturity.

Conclusion: The proposed development complies with Section 3.106.03.A.2.b.2.

Findings: Sections 3.106.03.C.1.a and C.2 provide that 20% of the paved surface area for off-street parking and circulation shall be landscaped. The density of landscaping required in and adjacent to off street parking and circulation facilities, EXCLUDING required trees, is one plant unit per 20 square feet. Section 3.106.03.C.4 provides that landscaping required by other provisions that is within 20 feet of the paved surface of off street parking and circulation facilities may also be counted as required landscaping for off-street parking and circulation areas. The site plan shows 14,498 square feet of parking and access area. The landscaping plan shows approximately 4,150 square feet of landscaped area within 20 feet of the paved surface of off-street parking and circulation facilities. The landscaping plan shows approximately 273 plant units in and adjacent to the parking area.

Conclusions: A total of 2,900 square feet of landscaping, stocked with at least 145 plant units excluding required trees, is required. The proposed development complies with Sections 3.106.03.C.1.a and C.2.

Findings: Section 3.106.03.C.3 provides that trees shall be planted within and abutting off street parking facilities in a pattern that is in proportion to the distribution of the parking spaces, at the following densities:

- a. 1 small tree per 5 parking spaces;
- b. 1 medium tree per 10 parking spaces; or
- c. 1 large tree per 14 parking spaces.

The site plan shows 39 off-street parking spaces. The landscaping plan shows three Autumn Blaze maples in or adjacent to the parking area. Autumn Blaze maples will reportedly grow to fifty or sixty feet tall with a mature spread of thirty to forty feet.

Conclusions: Autumn Blaze maples are large trees as described in Section 6.103. The proposed development would require 3 large trees. The proposed development complies with Section 3.106.03.C.3.

Findings: Section 3.106.03.E provides that: “The entire yard area of a property, EXCLUDING areas subject to more intensive landscaping requirements ... shall be landscaped to a standard of at least one (1) plant unit (PU) per 50 square feet prior to final occupancy.” The landscaping plan shows all site areas not covered by building, parking, or access ways to be planted with living plant materials. Per Table 3.1.5, lawn or other living ground cover has a plant unit value of 1 plant unit per 50 square feet.

Conclusion: The proposed development complies with Section 3.106.03.E.

Findings: Section 3.106.05.B provides that landscaped areas that are not covered by plant materials shall be covered by a layer of bark mulch or decorative rock, excluding ordinary crushed gravel, a minimum of 2 inches in depth. The submittal does not address this code provision.

Conclusion: The property owner must verify that landscaped areas that are not covered by plant materials will be covered by bark mulch or decorative rock, in accordance with Section 3.106.05.B.

Findings: Section 3.106.05.C provides that a six-inch concrete curb shall be provided between a landscaped area and a parking area or access way. The site plan shows existing or proposed curb at the perimeter of all parking areas and access ways.

Conclusion: The proposed development complies with Section 3.106.05.C.

### *WDO 3.107 Architectural Design Guidelines and Standards*

Findings: Section 3.107.06.A provides that “The following design guidelines shall be applicable to all non-residential structures and buildings in the RS, R1S, RM, CO, CG and P zones.” The proposed development is a clinic.

Conclusion: The proposed development is subject to the architectural design guidelines and standards of Section 3.107.



Findings: Section 3.107.06.B.1.a provides that “Building facades visible from streets and public parking areas *should* be articulated in order to avoid the appearance of box-like structures with unbroken wall surfaces.” The exterior elevation drawings show the façade facing Progress Way to have vertical articulation. The future expansion will increase the horizontal articulation.

Conclusion: The proposed development and proposed future expansion meet the guideline of WDO 3.107.06.B.1.a.

Findings: Section 3.107.06.B.1.b provides that “The appearance of exterior walls *should* be enhanced by incorporating three dimensional design features, including the following:

- 1) Public doorways and/or passage ways through the building.
- 2) Wall offsets and/or projections.
- 3) Variation in building materials and/or textures.
- 4) Arcades, awnings, canopies and/or porches.”

The exterior elevation drawings show the front (east) façade to have vertical articulation, an entry canopy, and vertical metal siding, horizontal lap siding, and brick.

Conclusion: The proposed development and proposed future expansion meet the guideline of WDO 3.107.06.B.1.b.

Findings: Section 3.107.06.B.2.a provides that “Building exteriors *should* exhibit finishes and textures that reduce the visual monotony of bulky structures and large structural spaces; enhance visual interest of wall surfaces and harmonize with the structural design.” The exterior elevation drawings show the façades to have vertical metal siding, horizontal lap siding, and brick.

Conclusion: The proposed development and proposed future expansion meet the guideline of WDO 3.107.06.B.2.a.

Findings: Section 3.107.06.B.2.b provides that “The appearance of exterior surfaces *should* be enhanced by incorporating the following:

- 1) At least 30% of the wall surface abutting a street *should* be glass.
- 2) All walls visible from a street or public parking area *should* be surfaced with wood, brick, stone, designer block, or stucco or with siding that has the appearance of wood lap siding.
- 3) The use of plain concrete, plain concrete block, corrugated metal, plywood, T-111 and sheet composite siding as exterior finish materials for walls visible from a street or parking area *should* be avoided.
- 4) The color of at least 90 percent of the wall, roof and awning surface visible from a street or public parking area should be an “earth tone” color containing 10 parts or more of brown or a “tinted” color containing 10 parts or more white. Fluorescent, “day-glo,” or any similar bright color *should not* be used on the building exterior.”

The exterior elevation drawings show the building to have metal, composite lap, and brick siding. The materials board provided by the applicant shows brownish-red metal wall panel, brown brick, and grey lap siding.

Conclusion: The proposed development meets the guidelines of WDO 3.107.06.B.2.b.

Findings: Section 3.107.06.B.3 provides that “Multi-planed Roof Guidelines.

- a. The roof line at the top of a structure *should* establish a distinctive top to the building.
- b. The roof line *should not* be flat or hold the same roof line over extended distances. Rather the roof line *should* incorporate variations, such as:
  - 1) Offsets and/or jogs in the plane of the roof.
  - 2) Changes in the height of the exterior wall for flat roof buildings, including parapet walls with variations in elevation and/or cornices.”

The exterior elevation drawings show the front façade to have two visible roof elevations.

Conclusion: The proposed development and proposed future expansion meet the guideline of WDO 3.107.06.B.3.

Findings: Section 3.107.06.B.4 provides that “All roof mounted equipment, EXCEPT solar collectors, *should* be screened from view from streets abutting the building site by:

- a. Locating roof mounted equipment below the highest vertical element of the building; or
- b. Screening roof top equipment using materials of the same character as the structure’s basic materials.”

The drawings show no roof-mounted equipment.

Conclusions: The proposed development meets the guideline of WDO 3.107.06.B.4. The proposed future expansion may meet the guideline of WDO 3.107.06.B.4.

Findings: Section 3.107.06.B.5 provides that “All building faces abutting a street or a public parking area *should* provide weather protection for pedestrians. Features to provide this protection should include:

- a. A continuous walkway at least 8 feet wide along the face of the building utilizing a roof overhang, arcade, awnings and/or canopies.
- b. Awnings and canopies that incorporate the following design features:
  - 1) Angled or curved surfaces facing a street or parking area.
  - 2) A covering of canvas, treated canvas, awning fabric, or matte finish vinyl.
  - 3) A constant color and pattern scheme for all buildings within the same development.
  - 4) No internal back lighting.”

The building plans show a covered entry at the main entrance.

Conclusion: The proposed development and proposed future expansion meet the guideline of WDO 3.107.06.B.5.

Findings: Section 3.107.06.B.6 provides that “The landscaping required by the standards of the WDO *should* be augmented to address site specific visual impacts of abutting uses and the visual character of the surrounding area.” The abutting uses are legal offices, a restaurant, a utility office and equipment yard, and vacant land.

Conclusion: The landscaping is in keeping with the visual character of the surrounding area. The proposed development and proposed future expansion meet the guideline of WDO 3.107.06.B.6.

Findings: Section 3.107.06.B.10 provides that “Obstruction of existing solar collectors on abutting properties by site development *should* be mitigated.” A site inspection showed no existing solar collectors on abutting properties. The nearest building to the south is approximately 60 feet from the clinic.

Conclusion: The proposed development and proposed future expansion meet the guideline of WDO 3.107.06.B.10.

Findings: Section 3.107.06.C.1 provides that “Access to and from the site and circulation within the site *should* separate facilities for cars, trucks and transit from those for bicycles and pedestrians.” The site plan shows a 6 foot wide pedestrian connection to a proposed sidewalk along Progress Way, and a bike rack for 5 bicycles. The site plan shows pedestrian access to the parcel to the north, but does not show pedestrian access to the parcel to the east.

Conclusion: The proposed development does not meet the guideline of Section 3.107.06.C.1. The property owner should provide pedestrian access to the parcel to the east.

Findings: Section 3.107.06.C.2.a.1 provides that “Vehicle access points *should* be identified by accentuated landscaped areas, by entrance throats designed to control access from abutting parking and by monument type entrance signs.” The site and landscaping plans show that the parking lot entrance is provided with landscaping and with curbs delineating the throat. The submittal does not address entrance signs.

Conclusion: The proposed development and proposed future expansion meet the guideline of Section 3.107.06.C.2.a.1.

Findings: Section 3.107.06.C.2.b.1 provides that “The buildings *should* be linked to the sidewalks on abutting streets by internal pedestrian ways. Such pedestrian ways *should* be either raised or delineated by distinctive pavers.” The site plan shows a 6 foot wide pedestrian connection to a proposed sidewalk along Progress Way.

Conclusion: The proposed development and proposed future expansion meet the guideline of Section 3.107.06.C.2.b.1.

Findings: Section 3.107.06.D.1 provides that “Within the prescribed setbacks, building location and orientation *should* compliment abutting uses and development patterns.”

Conclusion: The proposed development and proposed future expansion meet the guideline of WDO 3.107.06.D.1.

Findings: Section 3.107.06.E provides that “Off street parking between the architectural front of a building and the setback line abutting street *should* be limited to a depth of not more than 130 feet.” The site plan shows no parking between the building and Progress Way.

Conclusion: The proposed development and proposed future expansion meet the guideline of Section 3.107.06.E.

Findings: Section 3.107.06.F.1 provides that “Outdoor storage, when permitted, *shall* be screened from the view of abutting streets by a solid brick or architectural block wall not less than 6, nor more than 9 feet in height.” The site plan does not show an outdoor storage area.

Conclusion: This decision does not authorize outdoor storage.

*WDO 5.103.05                      Phasing Plan for a Subdivision, PUD, Manufactured Dwelling Park or any other Land Use Permit*

Findings: Section 5.103.05.A provides that “The purpose of a Phasing Plan is to allow the incremental implementation of a total development plan for a property, while providing fully functional phases that are developed in compliance with the tentative approval for the development.” The proposed project consists of a 6,804 square foot pediatric clinic, with a future 1,718 square foot expansion.

Conclusion: Approval of the phasing plan would allow the future expansion to occur without another Design Review or other land use decision.

Findings: Section 5.103.05.A provides that “The proposed phasing of development shall:

1. Insure that individual phases will be properly coordinated with each other and can be designed to meet City development standards; and
2. Insure the phases do not unreasonably impede other future development based on the following considerations:
  - a. The City’s future latitude in addressing:
    - 1) Changing community goals and expectations about the future development of undeveloped land; and
    - 2) Mandated state land use planning requirements, including those regarding buildable land, needed housing, transportation connectivity.
  - b. The latitude of future developers of abutting properties within the UGB in addressing:
    - 1) Changing market conditions; and
    - 2) The access and circulation alternatives for a development proposal.”

The site plan shows the proposed future expansion. The applicant has submitted elevation drawings of the expansion.

Conclusion: The proposed future expansion meets the criteria of Section 5.103.05.A.

*Overall Conclusions*

The proposed development meets or can meet the requirements of the Woodburn Development Ordinance with appropriate conditions of approval. Approval of the Phasing Plan means the future expansion does not require a separate Design Review.